<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 30, 2008. Claims 30, 32-34, and 36-43 are presented for examination, of which Claims 30 and 34 are in independent form. Claims 30 and 34 have been amended to define Applicants' invention still more clearly, and Claims 42 and 43 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 30, 32, 34, 36 and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the article entitled "Olympus Digital Vision D-320L D-220L Digital Camera Instructions" (hereinafter *Olympus*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,349 (*Saegusa*), and Claims 33 and 37 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Olympus*, *Saegusa*, and further in view of the article entitled "IEEE 1394: A Ubiquitous Bus" (hereinafter *IEEE 1394*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 30 and 34, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Claim 30 is directed to a method of controlling a data communication apparatus. The method includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to send image data selected by a user to a printer via a serial bus, the image data being sent from the data communication apparatus in response to the entering of a send instruction into the data communication apparatus. The method also includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to inhibit, invalidate, or ignore a predetermined user instruction other than a halt instruction while the image data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer. In addition, the method includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to halt transmission of the image data in response to entering the halt instruction into the data communication apparatus, while the image data is being sent to the

printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer. Further, the method includes a step of controlling the data communication apparatus to stop the inhibiting, invalidating or ignoring of the predetermined user instruction in response to disconnecting the data communication apparatus from the serial bus, while the image data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer.

Among other notable features of Claim 30 is that the data communication apparatus can be controlled to inhibit, invalidate or ignore a predetermined user instruction <u>other than a halt instruction</u> while the image data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer, and also that the data communication apparatus can be controlled to <u>halt transmission of the image data</u> in response to entering of the <u>halt</u> instruction into the data communication apparatus, while the image data is being sent to the printer and while the image data is being printed by the printer.

Olympus states that "The Condition indicator LED lights while printing, and other operations are disabled" (see right column on page 128). That is, in *Olympus*, during the printing operation, all other operations are disabled. Accordingly, it is not seen how *Olympus* could teach or suggest the above-noted features of "controlling the data communication apparatus to inhibit, invalidate or ignore a predetermined user instruction <u>other than a halt instruction</u> while the image data is being sent to the printer and <u>while the image data is being printed by the printer</u> [emphases added]" and "controlling the data communication apparatus to <u>halt transmission</u> of the image data to the printer in response to entering the halt instruction into the data communication apparatus, while the image data is being sent to the printer and <u>while the image data is being printed</u> by the printer [emphases added]", as recited in Claim 30. *Olympus* cannot teach or suggest these features of Claim 30, because other operations (i.e., other than printing) are

- 7 -

disabled during printing, whereas, by virtue of the features of Claim 30, <u>a halt instruction can be</u> <u>entered</u> to halt transmission of the image data while the image data is being printed by the printer and the halt instruction is not inhibited, invalidated or ignored during printing.

Nothing has been found in *Saegusa* that remedies the deficiencies of *Olympus* as a reference against Claim 30.

Accordingly, Claim 30 is believed to be patentable over *Olympus* and *Saegusa*, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination, if any.

Independent Claim 34 is an apparatus claim corresponding to method Claim 30, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 30.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as applied against the independent claims herein. Therefore, those claims are respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from Claim 30 or 34 and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, respectively, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard P. Diana/
Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 3422351v1